



DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION AND SCIENCE

Report of the Arbitral Body
on Salaries of Teachers
in Primary and Secondary Schools

ENGLAND AND WALES



LONDON

HER MAJESTY'S STATIONERY OFFICE

1967

PRICE 1s. 9d. NET

Remuneration of Teachers Act, 1965
Arbitral Body
Salary Scales for Teachers in Primary and
Secondary Schools

Introduction

1. The Arbitral Body was established by the Minister of Labour on 3rd July 1967 in accordance with the arrangements made on 14th April, 1965 under Section 3 of the Remuneration of Teachers Act, 1965, by the Secretary of State for Education and Science.

2. The Chairman of the Burnham (Main) Committee which is appointed under the Remuneration of Teachers Act, 1965 to consider the remuneration of teachers in primary and secondary schools submitted the following matters for the determination of the Arbitral Body in view of differences between the Management Panel and Teachers' Panel of the Committee:—

- (i) the basic scale as to minimum, maximum, length of scale and increments;
- (ii) personal additions, *i.e.* the graduate addition, the good honours addition and the merit addition;
- (iii) arrangements for assimilating two-year trained teachers to the present scale applicable to three-year trained teachers and any consequential adjustments;
- (iv) the method of calculating unit totals for the purpose of determining the group of individual schools (including special schools);
- (v) the salaries for Head Teachers, both as to the method of determining salaries and the amounts;
- (vi) as to Deputy Head Teachers, the method of determining salaries payable and the amounts;
- (vii) allowances for holders of graded posts, Heads of Department and second masters/mistresses;
- (viii) the salaries for teachers in special schools including such special allowances as are deemed appropriate;
- (ix) the London allowances;
- (x) arrangements for safeguarding the salaries of teachers whose posts are lost or whose salaries are diminished as a result of the reorganisation or closure of schools;
- (xi) possible arrangements for allowances for teachers serving in "priority schools";
- (xii) the operative date and duration of the new scales.

3. After making and exchanging written submissions the Panels were heard in London on Monday, 17th July, 1967.

The Teachers' Claim and the Management Offers

4. The main elements of the teachers' claim were for:

- (i) a basic scale of £900 minimum rising by ten annual increments of £80 to a maximum of £1,700 (see Table 1);



- (ii) a graduate addition of £150; a good honours addition of £150; a merit addition of £75, applicable to academic as well as pedagogic courses with two payments available;
- (iii) assimilation of teachers with less than three years' training to take place throughout the salary scale and the making of any consequential adjustments;
- (iv) under the unit total scheme for determining the grouping of individual schools, pupils up to the age of 15 in primary/secondary schools to count as $1\frac{1}{2}$ units with no change in the subsequent weighting (see Table 3);

[The Teachers' Panel said that they also had proposals in mind for unit ratings for special schools, but these had not been submitted to the Management Panel because it had not been found possible to reach agreement on the age weighting for primary and secondary schools.]

- (v) the expression of Head Teachers' salaries as the basic scale plus consolidated allowances;
- (vi) if the claim in para. 4(v) were accepted, a similar arrangement to be applied to Deputy Head Teachers' salaries;
- (vii) greater increases in allowances for graded posts, Heads of Departments and second masters/mistresses;
- (viii) with regard to teachers in special schools, an increase in the special allowance payable and in the qualifications merit payment;
- (ix) an increase of £30 per annum in the London allowance, *i.e.* up to £100 per annum;
- (x) complete safeguarding of the salaries of all teachers whose posts are lost or whose salaries are diminished as a result of reorganisation or closure of schools;
- (xi) the operative date of new salary scales to be 1st April, 1967; the duration of such scales to depend on the extent to which the teachers' claims are met.

5. With regard to possible arrangements for allowances for teachers serving in "priority schools" on which the Management had made certain proposals, the Teachers' Panel asked the Arbitral Body to remit the proposals to the Burnham Committee to give adequate opportunity for negotiation.

6. The main elements of the Management's final offers were for:—

- (i) an improved basic scale of £800 rising by increments of £30(2), £50(1), £60(3), £40(4), £50(2), £60(2), to a maximum of £1,470 (see Table 1);
- (ii) no changes in the present graduate addition of £100 and in the good honours addition of £120, and in the merit addition of £50;
- (iii) no change in the present position whereby assimilation of teachers with less than three years' training takes place only at the maximum of the scale;
- (iv) under the unit total scheme for determining the grouping of individual schools, pupils up to the age of 9 to count as 1 unit, those between 9 and 13 as $1\frac{1}{2}$ units with no change in the subsequent weighting [the Management had not made proposals for changes in the unit scheme for special schools];

- (v) Head Teachers to continue to be paid salaries on consolidated scales (see Table 2(a));
- (vi) Deputy Head Teachers to continue to be paid salaries on the basis of the qualified teacher rate plus an increased Deputy Head Teacher allowance (see Table 2(b));
- (vii) (a) allowances for graded posts to show no change under Scale I (£120), to be increased from £200 to £205 under Scale II, and to be increased from £300 to £310 under Scale III (see Table 2(c));
- (b) allowances for Heads of Departments to be increased from £200 to £205 (Grade A), £300 to £310 (Grade B), £420 to £435 (Grade C), £540 to £560 (Grade D), £660 to £685 (Grade E) (see Table 2(d));
- (c) no change in the present arrangement whereby allowances of second masters/mistresses are appropriately related to Deputy Head Teachers' allowances;
- (viii) no change in the £120 addition for teachers in special schools;
- (ix) no change in the London allowance of £70;
- (x) for teachers whose posts are lost or whose salaries are diminished as a result of reorganisation or closure of schools, complete safeguarding of salaries for teachers over 50; for teachers under 50, safeguarding for five years, and thereafter safeguarding of salary at the end of that period and of any incremental advances up to the maximum of the scale;
- (xi) provision to be made in order to meet the needs of "priority schools" in specially difficult areas, for adding to a Local Authority's "score" under the section relating to graded posts, in accordance with the following formula:—
 "One point for every 100 immigrant children registered on Form 7 in the schools in the area of the Authority, plus one point for every 2,000 children returned on Form 7 as registered in the schools in the area of the Authority";
- (xii) the operative date of new scales to be from 1st July, 1967 to 31st March, 1969.

Summary of Submissions made on behalf of the Teachers' Panel

7. In view of the importance of the education service in the modern world, the status of teachers needed to be raised substantially and salaries had to be sufficiently attractive to bring young entrants into the profession and to reduce wastage.

8. A study of the movement in the Index of Retail Prices between April 1965 and April 1967 showed that unless teachers were to be worse off over that period, their salaries would need to be increased by 7 per cent as from 1st April, 1967, but this would not allow at all for increases in the cost of living which might occur during the currency of any new agreement. There were, however, other compelling reasons to justify substantial increases being made.

9. Despite the suggestion that comparability should now play a minor role in negotiations, certain comparisons were inevitable. £15 a week had been canvassed as a minimum wage in industry, i.e. £50 a year more than the teacher's starting salary. From April 1967, the lowest paid administrative, professional and technical officer in local government, regardless of qualifications, was receiving £820 per annum, £90 a year more than a qualified teacher and £20 more than the final Management offer at the minimum of the basic scale.

10. Essential deductions from salary, *i.e.* tax, superannuation, national insurance contributions, etc. for a teacher on his minimum could be assessed at £174 per annum, leaving him with a net income of only £556 per annum. This was an inadequate wage particularly if, as frequently happened, he were living away from home.

11. An investigation by the Lodgings Bureau of London University showed that the average cost to a student in lodgings was £157 10s. over 30 weeks. When other expenses were added for lunches, teas, heating, laundry, clothes, books, fares, entertainment and retainer fees, the figure would mount to £343 10s. over 30 weeks, or £11 10s. per week. That was to say that a student, at his modest standard of living, was spending more than a qualified teacher at his minimum was able to spend. This was unjustifiable.

12. Salaries of teachers compared very unfavourably with those for the police, and a number of comparisons were quoted. A single policeman at 22 could earn nearly £200 per annum more than a teacher of the same age would receive under the Management Panel's offer.

13. 52.6 per cent of all teachers had no additional allowances and had to rely on the basic scale plus any personal additions.

14. The present trend had been to give greater proportionate salary increases to those at the lower end of the scales than to those at the top, and the Government had declared that, even in the period of restraint, the lower paid had to be given priority. The final offer of the Management Panel was, however, against the trend.

15. The current pattern of increments was uneven and illogical. In equity all increments should be of the same size. A shorter scale providing for ten increments of £80 was justified in present day conditions, having regard to the increased length of the college course, resulting in teachers starting work a year earlier and to the trend towards earlier marriage bringing with it increased social responsibilities at an earlier age.

16. The present maximum was much too low and provided poor prospects for thousands of three-year trained teachers. It compared most unfavourably with the ultimate expectations in journalism, banking, industry and commerce for people who often had inferior qualifications to those of a teacher. Comparisons were drawn with recent movements in the pay of business executives, doctors and other groups which indicated that the teachers' 13 per cent increase since April 1965 was not generous. Substantial increases in manual workers' wages, *e.g.* of seamen and busmen were not irrelevant in the determination of professional salaries, as the Prices & Incomes Board had indicated when in January 1966 it commended increases in the salaries of British Railways staff workers because these had been outstripped by manual workers' wages. Similarly in the Electrical Supply Industry, changes in the earnings of manual and technical staff had been held to justify increases for administrative and clerical workers.

17. It would be grossly unfair to argue that a 7 per cent increase to teachers would keep them abreast of Local Government Officers who recently received that rate of increase, as the wages of these Officers were often increased by upgrading to enable Councils to meet intense labour competition.

18. Whilst teachers' salaries may have kept pace with the movement of the average salaries index from October 1959 up to October 1965, a comparison at the end of March 1967 would clearly indicate that the teachers had lost ground.

19. With regard to incomes policy, at least two of the criteria for incomes behaviour laid down in the Government's White Paper "Prices & Incomes Policy After 30th June 1967" (Cmnd. 3235) justified salary increases for teachers. The teachers' contribution to productivity, though real, was not readily quantifiable but their promotion of efficiency through improved standards of service was clearly evident and was a fairer criterion for teachers in determining salary rates.

20. Now was the time to demonstrate the reality of statements that education was fundamental to economic growth and to a just, humane and civilised society.

21. There had been mounting evidence to show an alarming wastage from the teaching profession, other than wastage by marriage. One man in five was leaving teaching within five years of the end of his college training. Salaries were surely a significant factor in this situation.

22. It was a very serious matter that the country was losing large numbers of teachers permanently to overseas countries, especially to Canada. This situation would get worse unless the teaching profession were made more attractive at home.

23. If a success were to be made of raising the school leaving age, of carrying out educational reorganisation and of following up the Plowden Report, it was imperative that there should be more teachers. This would only be possible if teachers were given a good starting salary and good prospects.

24. The Teachers' Panel wished the graduate addition to be increased by £50 but to limit its application by excluding certain untrained graduates. Good honours graduates were desperately needed, especially in the science and mathematics field, and the Panel were claiming an increase of £30 in the allowance for such graduates. More of them would be needed with the raising of the school leaving age, with the increase in sixth forms and with the voluntary continuation at school after the statutory leaving age. There was a particularly urgent need to compete with the growing demands for graduates by industry and commerce and there was a very serious wastage of trained graduates from the profession. This situation could only be improved if the graduate additions were increased.

25. They were asking for an increase of £25 in the merit addition, because the present £50 was not enough to induce graduates and non-graduates to postpone teaching for a year, possibly to forego a year's salary and to lose a year's pension rights. Academic as well as pedagogical courses needed to be recognised because, by recognising the latter and not the former, teachers were dissuaded from following certain valuable courses. There should be provision for two merit additions instead of one to provide an additional incentive for further study.

26. The present arrangements on assimilation created an anomaly which resulted in the treatment of the two-year trained teacher depending on the date of his entering teaching. If entry took place now or if it occurred years ago, the

teacher was fully assimilated to the three year scale; if entry took place in the recent past, assimilation was denied. The cost of removing this anomaly had declined as more of those affected had reached the maximum. Assimilation should, therefore, take place throughout the salary scale and any consequential adjustments made.

27. With regard to the unit total scheme for determining the grouping of individual schools which had been examined by a Working Party of both sides, they felt that the introduction of the primary/secondary school differential at 13 had caused much bitterness. It was the Teachers' Panel's policy that all pupils under the age of 15 should count as $1\frac{1}{2}$ units, but that there should be no change in the remaining weightings for children over 15 years of age. Since the 1965 salary settlement, an examination of schools over a number of areas indicated that $1\frac{1}{2}$ points was still a viable proposition in relation to the new groups, that some primary schools would increase in group status whilst, in general terms, secondary schools would not be reduced in group status. The change was needed because service in primary schools needed to be more attractive, their curricula had been widened to include some subjects previously limited to the secondary field and the responsibility of their teachers had been increased. It was as important to attract well qualified Head Teachers to primary schools as it was to secondary schools but even with the Teachers' Panel's proposed change in the points system, Head Teachers of secondary schools would still have relatively higher salaries than those of primary schools of similar size. Their formula would improve salary opportunities in primary schools by increasing the gradings made available to some teachers holding graded posts. They detailed a number of other considerations but basically their view was that whatever types of school were used to cater for children under 15, there was little or no difference in the complexity of internal organisation. The Management Panel's proposals would have the effect of producing an elaborate hierarchy of schools, the most attractive being those schools catering for older children and the least attractive those catering for younger children. They had in mind certain changes in the formula for special schools but these had not been submitted to the Management Panel because it had not been possible to reach agreement on changes in the formula for primary and secondary schools. Their proposals were intended to restore former relativities between special and normal schools.

28. They urged as a basis for Head Teachers' salaries the adoption of consolidated allowances as an addition to the basic scale. It would remove certain anomalies that could arise on promotions to headships and there would be the advantage that Head Teachers would be assured that any future increases on the basic scale would accrue to them.

29. If their proposal for consolidated allowances for Head Teachers were accepted, Deputy Head Teachers should be treated similarly in order to remove certain existing anomalies.

30. Higher allowances for graded posts with an improved basic scale should be such as to provide adequate incentives for the ambitious and capable; present allowances were too low. Allowances for second masters/mistresses should never be less than that of the largest allowance for Head of Department in their schools and more nearly related to the salary of the Deputy Head Teacher.

31. The differential payment added to the salary of a teacher in a special school needed to be increased. With regard to the special qualifications payment,

since they had submitted that the merit addition should be increased by £25 to £75, they proposed that a suitable differential above £75 should be paid to teachers with the appropriate qualifications.

32. They were asking for an increase of £30 in the London allowance to bring it up to £100. This was a modest claim when compared with London allowances paid elsewhere.

33. They were asking for complete safeguarding of salaries of all teachers adversely affected by reorganisation. Unlike civil servants and local government officers, displaced teachers could not be transferred from area to area, nor could they readily find employment with other local authorities many of whom reserved promoted posts for their own teachers; there was moreover little scope for their employment outside their own profession. They could not claim resettlement or long term compensation or retire early on pension. The Teachers' Panel considered that no teacher should be allowed to suffer financial hardship as a result of reorganisation. If full protection was not possible, individual local authorities should be allowed to determine their own arrangements for protection. The Management's proposals had worsened teachers' conditions in the areas of some 40 Local Education Authorities who had given all the protection the teachers sought nationally.

34. The Management Panel's proposals on allowances for teachers serving in "priority schools" had been submitted and explained to the Burnham Committee but the Teachers' Panel had had no time to consider them in detail and no actual discussion on them had taken place on the Burnham Committee. Whilst they had since formed certain views on the matter which did not favour the Management Panel's proposals, they urged the Arbitral Body, in the circumstances, to refrain from making a decision on the proposals and to remit them to the Burnham Committee for full consideration.

35. With regard to the date of operation of any new scales determined by the Arbitral Body, this should be 1st April 1967 which was the date when teachers expected a new settlement to operate. In 1965 both sides of the Burnham Committee had agreed that the date of application of the new scales should be 1st April 1965 and that the scales should operate for two years from that date. There was no reason why back-dating should not take place. A statement had been made in Parliament that the teachers' settlement should operate from 1st July 1967, but the statement of a Minister did not have the force of law. As to the duration of the new scales, the Teachers' Panel, in the present time of economic uncertainty, were not prepared to accept the risks involved in committing themselves to accepting the scales for the period of 21 months from 1st July 1967 proposed by the Management Panel. They required a settlement for an increase substantially in excess of 6 per cent for a much shorter period.

Summary of Submissions made on behalf of the Management Panel

36. The Management Panel could not estimate with any precision the cost of the Teachers' Panel's pay claim as some of the items in it were not fully specified but on the basis of a hypothetical population of 290,000 full-time qualified teachers likely to be in service in April 1967, having a total annual salary of about £410 millions, they judged that the increases proposed would cost about £120 millions more per annum, representing an increase of almost 30 per cent on average over current salary levels.

37. In most respects, the teachers' pay claim was identical with the one they submitted in 1965 to the Arbitral Body which had determined in the main the current salary scales and provisions. The Management Panel could not find any sufficient change of circumstances to justify acceptance of the teachers' claim. In the light of the operation of the Government's incomes policy since the 1965 award and its impact on other sections of the community, the Management Panel submitted that their offers had been reasonable.

38. The 1965 Award had given the teachers a substantial pay improvement of 13 per cent which was to last until 31st March, 1967. In the White Paper on Prices & Incomes Policy (Cmnd. 2639) which was operative from April 1965 to July 1966, the "norm" of 3 to 3½ per cent was considered appropriate. The award to A.P.T. and C. staff in Local Government service of the order of 7 per cent to last for two years which was agreed early in July 1966, had been reached in the light of that policy but even so, its implementation had been deferred for six months to comply with the prices and incomes standstill policy announced by the Government from 20th July, 1966, in their White Paper (Cmnd. 3073). Since that time most groups for whom salary increases had been accepted had had such increases deferred for at least six months.

39. The teachers had submitted their claim against the background of the prices and incomes standstill, and despite the further White Paper (Cmnd. 3150) in November 1966 on the period of severe restraint, proposed that the increases claimed, amounting to almost 30 per cent, should take effect from 1st April, 1967, the date originally intended at the time of the 1965 settlement. The Management Panel had concluded that a pay increase during the "period of severe restraint" could not be justified and offered an operative date of 1st July, 1967, the earliest possible date after the end of the period of severe restraint.

40. The Management Panel believed that some improvements in teachers' pay could be justified under the criteria of the subsequent White Paper on "Prices and Incomes Policy after 30th June, 1967" (Cmnd. 3235). A revision of the unit total system could probably satisfy the criterion in para. 22(ii) of the White Paper and an increase in salary levels might be reasonably regarded as not inconsistent with the criterion in para. 22(iv).

41. In making their final offer to the teachers the Management Panel had taken a generous view in recognition of the fact that teachers were a socially valuable group of public employees. Implementation of their final offer would cost about £24½ millions per annum for full-time qualified teachers in maintained primary and secondary schools alone, and would represent an increase of 6 per cent on average over present incomes levels. They proposed that the agreement should continue to 31st March, 1969.

42. With regard to the basic scale, the Management Panel felt that it would be reasonable to concentrate the main movement on the entry point and to allow a uniform increase of £70 at each incremental point even though the idea of a uniform increase was a departure from traditional policy. They were anxious to meet any valid criticism of the starting salary because of the great emphasis which had been laid on the financial difficulties felt by young teachers starting at £730. Knowing that their proposal of a £800 minimum represented an increase of about 9½ per cent at that point, which was justified exceptionally, they had devised a scale which, whilst maintaining the cash differential, would fairly reflect their strong view that even an overall increase of 5 to 6 per cent would be generous in relation to Government incomes policy and to movements for other

groups of local authority employees. For posts above basic scale, the proposed cash differential had been increased in a number of cases so that the minimum increase remained of the order of 4 per cent. They could not devote any part of their offer to shortening the scale which would be expensive and they pointed out that the scale had been shortened by one year in each of the settlements of 1963 and 1965.

43. They proposed no adjustment in the graduate addition, the good honours addition and the merit addition. All teachers receiving any of these additions would benefit from the improvements the Management Panel were proposing in the basic scale element of their salaries.

44. On assimilation, the Management Panel did not wish to add to the evidence submitted to the Arbitral Body in 1965 when the Teachers' Panel had unsuccessfully submitted the same claim.

45. They analysed the differences between the Management Panel and Teachers' Panel, arising from a Working Party's examination of the unit total system (see Table 3). The Teachers' Panel's proposals costing over £5 millions per annum, were not acceptable because they reduced unreasonably the differential structure, they created more posts of responsibility in primary schools than were justified and they involved unreasonable increases in expenditure in responsibility payments in primary schools. On the other hand, the Management Panel's proposals, costing something over £2½ millions per annum, recognised firstly that the number of posts of responsibility required in a school increased with the age of the children and with the specialisation of work and the wider range of activities undertaken. Secondly they recognised that the number of posts above scale created in a school should bear a reasonable relationship to the realities of the number of such posts required in the conduct of the school. Thirdly, they took into account the fact that schools now emerging under reorganisation proposals involving infant schools, infant and junior schools, junior schools, middle schools, junior secondary schools, senior secondary schools and sixth-form colleges required a unit total structure which increased with the age of the children if the schools were to be effectively organised.

46. The Management Panel considered that the 1965 Arbitral Body had clearly confirmed the principle of consolidated scales for Head Teachers. The change made as a result of their award had been beneficial and there was also no reason to alter the division of schools into 14 groups. Head Teachers on consolidated scales would not benefit automatically from increases in the basic scale, and therefore, new scales had been proposed (see Table 2(a)). The Management Panel wished provision to be made to ensure that certain Head Teachers in post at the 1965 changeover date and who were still in the same posts in 1967 would be given the same protection afforded to them by the 1965 Arbitral Body, i.e. that they would receive, if necessary on a personal basis, no less an increase than that awarded at the basic scale maximum. They would also welcome a provision which would assure the continuation of protection on this basis for the diminishing number of teachers who required it at the 1965 changeover and were still occupying the same posts on the occasion of future Reports by Arbitral Bodies.

47. In considering salary increases which would accrue to Head Teachers, they considered it most important to bear in mind the effect of their proposed revision of the unit total system. The movement of a school from its present group to the next higher group as a result of proposed changes in the unit

system would have the effect of more than doubling the salary increases to be received by the particular Head Teachers whose schools were affected.

48. The Management Panel had accepted in principle the 1965 Arbitral Body's recommendation that "at a convenient time in the future, the existing system of paying allowances to Deputy Head Teachers should be replaced by consolidated scales of pay". But within the limits of incomes policy, they felt it would not be appropriate now to propose a structural change of this nature which when, accompanied by a degree of protection for those teachers in post who would otherwise be adversely affected, as was done in relation to Head Teachers in 1965, would result in many cases in very high proportional increases. They therefore proposed increases in the allowances payable to Deputy Head Teachers (see Table 2(b)). Deputy Head Teachers also stood to gain substantially from any changes of schools to a higher group as a result of a revision of the unit total system.

49. With regard to the extent of increases to both Head Teachers' salaries and Deputy Head Teachers' allowances, the Management Panel had largely based their proposals on the percentage increases offered at the maximum of the basic scale.

50. They had proposed increases in allowances and additional payments for Heads of Departments and for teachers holding graded posts (see Table 2(c) and (d)). No increase was proposed in the Scale I allowance, and increases of £5 and £10 only were proposed in Scale II and III posts respectively. In making their proposals, the Management Panel had taken into account the substantial additional remuneration which many teachers could receive as a result of a movement of a school to a higher group if their proposed changes in the unit total system were implemented.

51. They proposed no change in the special schools addition.

52. They proposed no change in the London allowance which had been increased to £70 as a result of the Report of the Arbitral Body in 1965. The Management Panel did not think it appropriate, in view of the size and recent nature of the increase, to propose a further improvement against the background of current economic circumstances. They did not, however, rule out the possibility of looking at the Burnham provision again in the light of whatever the National Board for Prices & Incomes might recommend after their examination of London Weighting in the Civil Service and elsewhere.

53. On the safeguarding of salaries, the Management Panel considered that the teachers' claim for full safeguarding in perpetuity went far beyond anything agreed elsewhere in the public service. Moreover, they could not accept the principle that a teacher of whatever age or experience should in whatever circumstances continue indefinitely to be paid the salary appropriate to a post once held, regardless of the fact that he would be occupying a post of lesser responsibility to which a lower salary applied. The proposals of the Teachers' Panel constituted a major departure from the basic principle of the rate for the job which applied not only in the teaching service but throughout a wide range of public services. The Management Panel submitted that their own proposals providing full safeguarding for those aged 50 or over and providing for safeguarding for five years, including all benefits that would have derived in the post held during that period, for those under 50, must be regarded as generous.

54. The Management Panel had considered the Plowden Report's recommendation that additional payments should be made to teachers in "deprived areas". They had tabled a formula for dealing with this recommendation but appreciated that the Teachers' Panel might reasonably claim that there had not been adequate time for negotiation or discussion. They considered it important, however, that the Arbitral Body should settle whether some provision of this kind should be made. If they did so, the Management Panel would discuss the details of the formula with the Teachers' Panel in the hope that an agreement would be found. They asked the Arbitral Body to specify a reasonable period of time in which such an agreement might be reached, failing which the latter could be settled at arbitration in detail as well as in principle.

Award

55. The Arbitral Body have given careful consideration to the evidence and submissions of the Panels and award that:—

(i) the basic scale shall be as follows:—

	£
0	800
1	830
2	860
3	910
4	970
5	1,030
6	1,090
7	1,140
8	1,190
9	1,240
10	1,290
11	1,340
12	1,390
13	1,440
14	1,500

- (ii) the graduate addition shall remain at £100 and the good honours addition at £120; the merit addition shall remain at £50 and there shall be no changes in the current provisions relating to this addition;
- (iii) no change shall be made in the existing arrangements for assimilating two-year trained teachers;
- (iv) (a) there shall be no change in the formula for determining the grouping of primary and secondary schools under the unit total system;
- (b) with regard to the unit total system relating to handicapped pupils in special schools, the Panels should have discussions at the Burnham Committee with a view to reaching agreement on a new formula; if the Panels fail to reach agreement within three months hereof, either Panel shall be at liberty to report such failure to the Arbitral Body and, in that event, the Arbitral Body will, after hearing the Panels, determine the difference;

- (v) (a) there shall continue to be consolidated scales of pay for Head Teachers, to which the only allowance applicable shall be the London allowance, as follows:—

Primary and Secondary Schools

	<i>Group</i>	<i>Minimum</i>	<i>Increments</i>	<i>Maximum</i>
		£	£	£
	0		50	1,710
	1		50	1,820
	2	1,770	50 (3)	1,920
	3	1,845	60 (3)	2,025
	4	1,945	60 (4)	2,185
	5	2,070	75 (4)	2,370
	6	2,285	75 (4)	2,585
	7	2,500	75 (4)	2,800
	8	2,710	75 (4)	3,010
	9	2,955	75 (4)	3,255
	10	3,165	75 (4)	3,465
	11	3,380	75 (4)	3,680
	12	3,595	100 (3)	3,895
	13	3,810	100 (3)	4,110

Special Schools

	<i>Group</i>	<i>Minimum</i>	<i>Increments</i>	<i>Maximum</i>
		£	£	£
	1 (S)		50	1,960
	2 (S)	1,860	50 (4)	2,060
	3 (S)	1,945	60 (4)	2,185
	4 (S)	2,105	60 (4)	2,345
	5 (S)	2,265	60 (4)	2,505
	6 (S)	2,420	75 (4)	2,720
	7 (S)	2,580	75 (4)	2,880

- (b) it should be ensured that Head Teachers who were in post in 1965 at the time of the changeover to consolidated scales, and who are still in the same posts, should receive, on a personal basis, no less an increase in salary than is awarded at the basic scale maximum. This protection should continue to apply on the occasion of future changes in the consolidated scales to those Head Teachers who will still be occupying the same posts as they did at the time of the 1965 changeover;

- (vi) (a) there shall be allowances payable to Deputy Head Teachers, as additions to the basic scale, as follows:—

<i>Group</i>	<i>£</i>	<i>Group</i>	<i>£</i>
3	145	3 (S)	155
4	215	4 (S)	235
5	290	5 (S)	315
6	375	6 (S)	425
7	480	7 (S)	535
8	575		
9	670		
10	765		
11	860		
12	960		
13	1,055		

- (b) in accordance with the recommendation of the Arbitral Body in 1965, consideration should still be given, at a convenient time in the future, to replacing the existing system of allowances for Deputy Head Teachers by consolidated scales of pay;

- (vii) (a) there shall be three scales in graded posts valued as follows:—

	<i>£</i>
Scale I	125
Scale II	210
Scale III	315;

- (b) there shall be five grades of Heads of Department as follows:—

	<i>£</i>
Group A	210
Group B	315
Group C	445
Group D	570
Group E	700;

- (c) there shall be no change in the current provisions relating to additional payments for second masters/mistresses;
- (viii) the addition applicable to teachers in special schools shall be £130; the special qualifications addition shall be £10;
- (ix) the London allowance shall be £70, but should be reviewed by the Burnham Committee in the light of the report to be made by the National Board for Prices and Incomes after their examination of London weighting in the Civil Service and elsewhere;
- (x) a teacher whose post is lost or whose remuneration is diminished as a result of reorganisation or closure of a school but who continues in the teaching service of the Local Education Authority shall be safeguarded in respect of both the salary he enjoyed at the date of reorganisation or closure and any further benefit which he would have enjoyed if he had continued in occupation of that post under the provisions of the present or subsequent Burnham Reports, provided that if a teacher so safeguarded unreasonably refuses an offer of an appointment by the Authority the safeguarding shall cease;

- (xi) provision should be made for additional payments to be made to teachers in "priority schools" in accordance with the Report of the Central Advisory Council under the Chairmanship of Lady Plowden; the Panels should, through negotiation at the Burnham Committee, endeavour to agree on a formula as a basis for assessing such additional payments;
- if the Panels fail to reach agreement within three months from the date hereof, either Panel shall be at liberty to report such failure to the Arbitral Body and, in that event, the Arbitral Body will, after hearing the Panels, determine the difference;
- (xii) the new scales shall operate retrospectively from 1st July, 1967 and continue until 31st March, 1969.

GEORGE HONEYMAN, *Chairman.*
W. H. LAWSON.
H. D. HUGHES.

21st July, 1967.

W. A. THOMAS,
Secretary.
Ebury Bridge House,
London, S.W.1.

TABLE 1

TABLE SHOWING GROUP I OF THE PRESENT BASIC SALARY SCALE,
THE SCALE CLAIMED BY THE TEACHERS AND THE SCALE FINALLY
OFFERED BY THE MANAGEMENT

Incremental Point	Existing Group I Scale £	Teachers' Claim £	Management's Final Offer £
0	730	900	800
1	760	980	830
2	790	1,060	860
3	840	1,140	910
4	900	1,220	970
5	960	1,300	1,030
6	1,020	1,380	1,090
7	1,060	1,460	1,130
8	1,100	1,540	1,170
9	1,140	1,620	1,210
10	1,180	1,700	1,250
11	1,230		1,300
12	1,280		1,350
13	1,340		1,410
14	1,400		1,470

TABLE 2

TABLE SHOWING MANAGEMENT PANEL'S FINAL PROPOSALS FOR SALARIES OF HEAD TEACHERS; ALLOWANCES FOR DEPUTY HEAD TEACHERS; ALLOWANCES FOR HEADS OF DEPARTMENT AND GRADED POSTS

Note:—Present salaries or allowances are shown in brackets. The Management Panel proposed no changes in incremental progression in the scale for qualified head teachers.

(a) *Qualified Head Teachers*

Group	Minimum Increments	Maximum
0	Increments of £50 to	£1,670 (£1,600)
1	Increments of £50 to	£1,770 (£1,700)
2	£1,720 (£1,650) £50(3)	£1,870 (£1,800)
3	£1,800 (£1,720) £60(3)	£1,980 (£1,900)
4	£1,890 (£1,810) £60(4)	£2,130 (£2,050)
5	£2,015 (£1,925) £75(4)	£2,315 (£2,225)
6	£2,225 (£2,125) £75(4)	£2,525 (£2,425)
7	£2,430 (£2,325) £75(4)	£2,730 (£2,625)
8	£2,640 (£2,525) £75(4)	£2,940 (£2,825)
9	£2,875 (£2,750) £75(4)	£3,175 (£3,050)
10	£3,080 (£2,950) £75(4)	£3,380 (£3,250)
11	£3,290 (£3,150) £75(4)	£3,590 (£3,450)
12	£3,495 (£3,350) £100(3)	£3,795 (£3,650)
13	£3,700 (£3,550) £100(3)	£4,000 (£3,850)
1(S)	Increments of £50 to	£1,905 (£1,800)
2(S)	£1,810 (£1,700) £50(4)	£2,010 (£1,900)
3(S)	£1,895 (£1,810) £60(4)	£2,135 (£2,050)
4(S)	£2,050 (£1,960) £60(4)	£2,290 (£2,200)
5(S)	£2,205 (£2,110) £60(4)	£2,445 (£2,350)
6(S)	£2,355 (£2,250) £75(4)	£2,655 (£2,550)
7(S)	£2,510 (£2,400) £75(4)	£2,810 (£2,700)

(b) *Deputy Head Teachers*

Group	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
	£140 (£140)	£210 (£205)	£285 (£275)	£370 (£360)	£470 (£455)	£565 (£545)	£655 (£635)
Group	10	11	12	13			
	£750 (£725)	£845 (£815)	£940 (£905)	£1,035 (£1,000)			
Group	3(S)	4(S)	5(S)	6(S)	7(S)		
	£150 (£150)	£230 (£225)	£310 (£300)	£415 (£400)	£525 (£500)		

(c) *Graded Posts*

I	II	III
£120 (£120)	£205 (£200)	£310 (£300)

(d) *Heads of Departments*

Grade	A	B	C	D	E
	£205 (£200)	£310 (£300)	£435 (£420)	£560 (£540)	£685 (£660)

TABLE 3
THE UNIT TOTAL SYSTEM

<i>Age</i>	<i>Current Provisions</i>	<i>Teachers' Proposal</i>	<i>Management Proposal</i>
5-8	1	1½	1
9-12	1	1½	1½
13-14	2	1½	2
15	4	4	4
16	6	6	6
17 and over	10	10	10

